



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/663,574	09/16/2003	Gabriel G. Marcu	2095.000900/P3112	5291
23720	7590	05/29/2008	EXAMINER	
WILLIAMS, MORGAN & AMERSON			RATCLIFFE, LUKE D	
10333 RICHMOND, SUITE 1100			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
HOUSTON, TX 77042			3662	
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
05/29/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
10663574	9/16/2003	MARCU, GABRIEL G.	2095.0000900/P3112

EXAMINER

LUKE D . RATCLIFFE

ART UNIT	PAPER
----------	-------

3662 20080526

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

The majority of the argument that were presented on 3/3/08 have already been addressed by the examiner throughout the history of the case. However the arguments presented on 3/3/08 will also be addressed in this communication.

Referring to the argument that Bachmann does not disclose any adjustment of an incident angle based upon the reflection having a reflected angle: Bachmann shows rotating the disk to alter the incident angle of the light onto the reflecting disk to adjust the reflection unit the reflection reaches the aperture on the screen from which the light is emitted (column 4 line 39 and 40, column 1 line 44-65 and column 5 line 5-20).

Referring to the argument that the incident angle is not changed: the incident angle is the angle at which the light is incident to the reflector and therefor is inherently changed whenever the reflector is altered to change the position of the reflection on the screen which Bachmann does by rotating the disk.

Referring to the argument that Bachmann does not disclose a first and a second apparatus: The applicant clearly pointed out that there are two brackets disclosed by Bachmann, because there are two brackets there is a first and second apparatus.

Referring to the argument that Holzl does not disclose electronic circuitry: Holzl shows electronic signals from an opto-electronic position detector (column 4 line 48), these electronic signals can not be used without the use of circuitry. While Holzl does not paint the picture of traces along with electronic components it is inherent.

Referring to the argument that Holzl and Bachmann were not combined properly: When the original rejection was written the KSR case had not been decided however now in light of the KSR decision the examiner believes that the combination of Bachmann and Holzl would have been obvious because this is a combination of prior art elements according to known methods to yield predictable results.

Referring to the argument that Backmann and Dankliker are no combined properly: When the original rejection was written the KSR case had not been decided however now in light of the KSR decision the examiner believes that the combination of Bachmann and Kankliker would be obvious because this is a combination of prior art elements according to known methods to yield predictable results. Backmann and Dankliker both show a system to align a first and second apparatus. The Dankliker reference was cited to show that it is common to align screens such as a computer or TV LCD screen.

/Thomas H. Tarcza/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3662